

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the thorough review of the present application as reflected in the Official Action mailed January 10, 2005. Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 8, 19 and 30. Applicants have amended the independent Claims 1, 12 and 23 to incorporate recitations from these claims and intervening claims and have, accordingly, cancelled Claims 5-8, 16-19 and 27-30. Applicants have added new Claims 34-36.

The Objection to the Title

Applicants have amended the Title along the lines suggested by the Examiner. Applicants note that the Examiner's statement that a computer program product is redundant is incorrect in that the scope of the methods and the computer program product claims differs. Applicants have, nonetheless, removed references to methods, systems and computer program products from the title. Applicants submit that the amendment to the title overcomes the Examiner's objection.

The Objection to the Summary of the Invention

The Official Action objects to the specification with regard to the Summary of the Invention stating that the advantages of the invention should be specified. Official Action, pp. 2-3. Applicants disagree as the citation on which the objection is based expressly states that the summary "may point out the advantages of the invention." See Official Action, p. 2. Applicants submit that the Summary of the Invention properly recites what Applicants' regard as their invention. The fact that the language of the Summary generally corresponds to the language to the claims is irrelevant as to whether the requirements for the content of the specification are met. In fact, the cited portion expressly states that the summary should be "directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole." Official Action, p. 2. That is what Applicants have done in as much as the invention is defined by the claims. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the objection to the Summary of the Invention.

The Objection to the Drawings

Applicants provide herewith a Replacement Sheet of Figure 3 amended to recite a tree map module as requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the objection to the drawings has been overcome.

The Claim Objections

Claim 8 is objected to because of the use of the term "the at least on a threshold value." Official Action, p. 4. Applicants have corrected this language as suggested by the Examiner when writing recitations from Claim 8 into Claim 1.

The Section 101 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-11, 12-13, 15-17 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Official Action, p. 4. While Applicants do not concur in the propriety of these rejections, to expedite prosecution, the recitations of Claims 8 and 19 have been incorporated into Claims 1 and 12. Furthermore, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite a "computer-implemented method" and Claim 12 to recite a "computer-implemented system." Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejections under § 101 have been obviated.

The Section 102 Rejection

Claims 1-6, 9-11, 12-17 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated "by a mental process performed by a human being augmented with a pencil and paper." Official Action, p. 5. Applicants submit that the Section 102 rejection is clearly improper as no prior art is cited nor is there an assertion that the mental process described in the rejection actually took place, only that it could have taken place. Applicants further submit that the claims may not be properly interpreted to read on a human being drawing on a piece of paper. While Applicants do not concur in the propriety of these rejections, to expedite prosecution, the recitations of Claims 8 and 19 have been incorporated into Claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejections under § 102 have been obviated.

The Section 112 Rejection

Claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Official Action, p. 6. In particular, the Official Action asserts that the term "relative" in Claims 1, 12 and 33 renders the claims indefinite. While Applicants do not concur in the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have amended the claims to recite that the first data set has a first amount of data and the second data set has a second amount of data that is less than the first amount of data. Thus, the claims make clear that the filtering reduces the amount of data that is used to generate the second tree map visualization. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 1-33 are not indefinite.

With regard to Claim 5, Applicants have corrected the antecedent basis for the term "the tree map visualization" and to specify the second tree map visualization when incorporating recitations from Claim 5 into Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 has been overcome.

The Obviousness Rejections

Claims 1-4, 9-15, 20-26 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious in light of Schneiderman "Tree Visualization with Tree-Maps: 2-d Space Filling Approach" (hereinafter "Schneiderman") and U.S. Patent No. 6,470,383 to Leshem et al. (hereinafter "Leshem"). Official Action, p. 7. Claims 5-7, 16-18 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious in light of Schneiderman, Leshem and United States Patent No. 6,101,279 to Nguyen (hereinafter "Nguyen"). Official Action, p. 14. While Applicants do not concur in the propriety of these rejections, to expedite prosecution, the recitations of Claims 8, 19 and 30 have been incorporated into Claims 1, 12 and 23. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejections under § 103 have been obviated.

The New Claims

Applicants have added new independent Claim 34 and dependent Claims 35 and 36. These claims have language similar to original Claim 10 but have been amended to address the objections discussed above. Applicants submit that new independent Claim 34 is patentable over

the cited portions of Leshem and Schneiderman as Applicants submit that the cited portions of these references do not describe generating a display of the filtered out data from the first data set as recited in the new claims.


Because Claim 10 was rejected based on the combination of Leshem and Schneiderman, Applicants will discuss the new claims with reference to the rejection of Claim 10. In particular, Applicants submit that merely because Leshem may show multiple portions of logs or that multiple logs can be shown as asserted in rejecting Claim 10 (Official Action, p. 13), does not disclose or suggest that the filtered out portions of data used to generate a tree map visualization be displayed. Furthermore, Applicants submit that Leshem relates to displays that are not tree map visualizations and, therefore, may not have the same considerations as are involved in the generation of tree map visualizations as described, for example, in the present Specification at page 9. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Schneiderman and Leshem may not be properly combined to result in the recitations of the newly added Claims 34-36.

In light of the above discussion, Applicants submit that Claims 34-36 are patentable over the cited portions of Schneiderman and Leshem for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

In light of the above discussion, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (919) 854-1400.

Respectfully submitted,


Timothy J. O'Sullivan
Registration No. 35,632

USPTO Customer No. 20792
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec
Post Office Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: 919/854-1400
Facsimile: 919/854-1401

In re: Leah Jr., et al.
Serial No.: 10/666,704
Filed: September 19, 2003
Page 3 of 13

In the Drawings:

Applicants provide a Replacement Sheet containing a a revised Figure 3. Figure 3 has been revised to add "module" to item 260.

Enclosure: 1 Replacement Sheet (Figure 3)